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Despite the wealth of recent research on China’s middle period, local society and state control in North China under the Jin and Yuan remain unexamined.¹ Work to date on middle-period history has given us a greater understanding of the economy and demographics of the Song, but it is confined to trends in the south, taking the Jiangnan region as the focus of research. As such, not much light has been shed on society in North China under Jurchen and Mongol control after the demise of the Northern Song, not to mention the forms of Jurchen and Mongol rule.² Likewise, although research related to

Translator’s note: This article was originally published as “Kingendai kahoku ni okeru shūken shibyōsaisi kara mita chihōkan no keihu: sansei heiyōken ōjunkōhyo wo chushinni” 金元代華北における州縣祠廟祭祀からみた地方官の系譜—山西平遙縣応潤侯廟を中心に (Administrative legacies and worship at prefectural and county temples in North China under the Jin and Yuan: the case of the Yingrun hou Temple in Pingyao, Shanxi) in Tōyō Gakuhō 東洋学報, June 2003. In rendering it in English I have consulted with the author to achieve clarity while preserving the original meaning and intent. At times this led to reorganizing sentences and paragraphs, or inserting additional points of explanation. Likewise, mistakes and omissions in the original publication have been corrected.

1. “North China” is used in this article to refer to what is known today in the People’s Republic of China as the provinces of Hebei, Shandong, Henan, Shanxi, and Shaanxi.
2. On research related to North China under the Jin and Yuan, see Iiyama Tomoyasu,

the politics, economy, and military of the Yuan dynasty and Mongol Empire has developed steadily, little work has been done on Jurchen and Mongol rule of the north. In light of this problem, the following article addresses the role of local officials in society and the social and political control they enacted in North China under the Jin and Yuan.

Research on the north has not been completely lacking. Indeed, some of the first work on this subject was undertaken by Kobayashi Morihiro 吉林森廣, who examined the professional development of local officials as reflected in the Yuan dynasty guanzhenshu 官箴書 (guidebooks for governance), and Elizabeth Endicott-West, who investigated Yuan dynasty local government through the activities of the daruya (an office created by the Mongols for the purpose of governing conquered territories) and subofficial functionaries (xuli 胥吏). However, both of these scholars have only given general overviews of Yuan dynasty provincial rule, and in doing so they consider the dynasty as a discrete unit of time separate from what came before or after. We therefore lack a comprehensive perspective of the developments in North China under Jurchen and Mongol rule since the fall of the Northern Song, and have little understanding of the degree of continuity between the prefectural and county administrations of the Yuan and that of the Northern Song, Liao, and Jin. Furthermore, these studies focused primarily on administrative structures and the nature of the central bureaucracy, but did not address the actual practice of local government or the interaction and intersection of state and society.

In attempting to address these issues, I have shown elsewhere that the changing of local power-holders in North China during the Jin and Yuan did


3. The dynastic name “Yuan” was not determined until 1271 (Zhiyuan 8). However, for the sake of convenience, I refer to the seating of Qubilai in 1260 as the beginning of the Yuan and everything prior to that as the Mongol empire.

not necessarily coincide with the rise and fall of dynasties. In an investigation of local elite advancement strategies, I pointed to a situation of continuity in local influence and authority from the Northern Song through the Jin and Yuan. Given those findings, it is also necessary to investigate local governance and how local officials confronted particular situations in their jurisdiction, and to do so from a trans-dynastic perspective. Furthermore, it is also necessary to look at the local circumstances of officials of the time, as well as how those local officials were evaluated by their predecessors. This will not only reveal developments in local control, but also lead to a consideration of the character and mechanism of that control.

What methods, then, will be most effective in getting at these questions? In order to advance research along a longer time frame, I propose to look at phenomena and events diachronically. An arbitrary example of such a method would be irrigation and land reclamation, which by their very nature were long-term enterprises and thus would serve as suitable objects of investigation. However, in undertaking such inquiry, we must be wary of the problem of the paucity of historical records that can provide the necessary details and description for a concrete investigation. For instance, although we should make use of the memorials and personal correspondence of officials, as well as administrative guidebooks, each of these sources has its limitations. We have ample memorials and other correspondence from the early and middle Yuan, but the vast majority of these documents focus exclusively on the policies and circumstances of that period alone and thus cannot serve as primary sources for a trans-dynastic inquiry. Although administrative guidebooks offer a broader perspective and are very important, they are rather general in content and can hardly be used as the primary basis for this research.

A wealth of material does exist that can provide a window on local governance over an extended period of time. This material consists of stone

---

5. Iiyama Tomoyasu 飯山知保, “Kingendai kahoku shakai ni okeru zaichi yūyokusha: hikoku kara mita zaichiyūyokusha: hibun kara mita sansei teijoken no jirei” 金元代華北社会における在地有力者——碑刻からみた山西, *Shigaku zasshi* 112, no. 4 (2003). [Translator’s note: This article looks at the composition of local elite in the north from the Northern Song through the Yuan. It shows that new dynasties attempted to reorganize local power structures by introducing new recruiting systems, such as military position or fostering connections with Mongol princes. Local elite, however, effectively adapted to these new conditions to maintain their local influence. Iiyama further argues that this differentiated the northern elite from their southern counterparts, who continued to rely on civil examinations as the chief means of advancement.]
inscriptions that document devotional practices at prefectural and county temples. In traditional Chinese society, rituals in response to disaster or crisis served as an occasion for officials who oversaw legal matters and taxation to come into direct contact with local society. After such ceremonial observances, stelae were usually erected in order to commemorate a miracle performed by a deity and the local officials who conducted the observances. These stelae therefore preserve an abundance of documentation relating to one and the same shrine over a stretch of time. Many of the inscriptions additionally record local officials’ knowledge of previous worship practices conducted by their predecessors, further aiding in the reconstruction of historical continuities.

The inscriptions contain a great deal of variability, however, and relate vast differences in the scale and history of various temples, the deities worshiped, and the temple locations. Thus, it would be impossible to make all cases of temple practices the object of a comprehensive analysis. Accordingly, this article will focus specifically on groups of shrines that bear a definite similarity to one another. Given that the Northern Song reformed worship policy, and that the increase in granting honors and titles to shrines in the later half of the period led to dynastic recognition of local temples to local gods as official places of worship (zhengei 正祠), this article also considers the deities and shrines from various localities where officials actively established individual local deities as the objects of worship, as well as the positions of these officials in their localities. I have been able to pinpoint with a degree of certainty the cases in which temples were used as devotional sites by a succession of local officials after the fall of the Northern Song. This article therefore looks at

---

6. On Northern Song religious policy see Sue Takashi 須江隆, "Kinei Nananen no Miko-tonori: Hokusō Shinsōchōki no Shigaku Shigō” 隋寧七年的詔——北宋神宗朝期の賜額・賜号, Tōhoku daigaku Tōyōshi Ronshu 8 (2001); Sue Takashi, “Tōsōki niokeru shibyō no byōgaku hōgō no kashi nisuite” 唐宋期における祠廟の廟額・封号の下賜について, Chūgoku Shakai to Bunka (2002); Matsumoto Kōichi 松本浩一, “Sōdai no Shigaku Shigō nitsuite” 宋代の賜額・賜号について, in Chūgokushi niokeru chuō seiji to chihō shakai, ed. Nogushi Tetsurō, 1986; Mizukoshi Tomo 水越知, “Sōdai shakai to shibyō shinkō no tenkai: chiikikaku toshiteno shibyō no shutsugen” 宋代社会と祠廟信仰の展開——地域核としての祠廟の出現, Tōyōshi kenkyū 60, no. 4 (2002). Research among European and American scholars in recent years on so-called “popular religion” also tangentially touches on this topic. For a good discussion of these debates see Mori Yuri 森由利亜, “Kinnen no beikoku niokeru chūgokushisō shūkyō kenkyū: tsūzoku shūkyō popular religion to i hanchū omegutte” 近年の米国における中国思想宗教研究: 通俗宗教 popular religion という範疇をめぐって, Tōhōgaku 104 (2002).
those temples used as official sites of worship in the Jin and Yuan that had previously been included in the registers and statutes (sidian 祀典) and were granted titles and honorary names by the Northern Song. Furthermore, it takes up the ritual activities of these temples, which offer rare but concrete cases that illuminate how local officials of the Jin and Yuan handled the policies of their Northern Song predecessors.

For the above reasons, then, this article does not look at temples and deities introduced to the locality by the dynasty, such as interregional deities of mountains and rivers—e.g. the Five Sacred Mountains and the Four Watercourses (wuyue sidu 五嶽四瀆)—the Altar of Soil and Grain (shejitan 社稷壇), the Sage Confucius (xuansheng 宣聖), or the masters of wind, rain, and thunder (fengyulei shuai 風雨雷師). Instead, it looks at those gods that received titles and honors from the Northern Song that had an indigenous and local character even while serving as the objects of worship for local officials in certain provinces. The majority of the sources for this article are drawn from the prefectures and counties of Shanxi, which give insights into ways in which local officials dealt with the legacies of their predecessors from previous dynasties, and thereby illustrate the consistency of governing strategies across dynastic divides.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Translator’s note: As a point of clarification, it should be mentioned here that these sources on North China under the Song, Jin, and Yuan, give a picture of the state playing the determining role in the worship of specific deities and their spread. As will be discussed below, contrary to the south, where people frequently changed gods to worship those deemed more efficacious, and where the dynasty edited its registers and statutes (sidian) to include new deities, sources on North China under both the Jin and Yuan show that people did not change gods and new deities were not added to the registers. Furthermore, unlike deities in the Southern Song, which had titles and positions in the celestial bureaucracy, and thus did not need the state for hierarchical authority, those in the north relied solely on state titles and inclusion in the registers for their authority and position in the hierarchy. Likewise, deities in the north only went by names relating to their characteristics or location, e.g. “Cattail Platform,” or “God of Rocks.” What sources from the north tell us then is that the state was important in the field of popular religion in a way it was not in the south, and it is through this that we can begin to assess the nature of local governance in the Jin and Yuan. For a good example of the importance of state legitimization in popular religion see Iguro Shinobu 井黒忍, “Chūgoku sansei nanbu ni okeru kiushi saishi: Tensui nōgyō Chi’iki ni suishin sinkō ni kansuru rekishiteki kousatsu” 中国山西東南部における祈雨祭祀——天水農業地域の水神信仰に関する歴史的考察, in Bunka kōshō ni yoru henyō no shosou 文化交渉による変容の諸相, ed. (Osaka: Kansai daigaku, 2010).
The following conspectus summarizes a number of temples in various locations which received honors and titles from the Northern Song court, and which are documented in post-Northern Song materials. There are thirteen shrines, the history of which we can reconstruct with relative precision, and the role of which in local government and society I will focus on below.\(^8\)

1. Zhenze temple 報澤廟. This temple was originally called the Temple of the Two Female Immortals of the Yue Family (Yue nuerxian miao 樂女二仙廟), and dedicated to the two daughters of Yue Shanbao 樂山寶, who were born in Ren village 任村, Huguan county 壽闕縣, Lu prefecture 蕭州, and appear to have risen to immortal status in their teens. The shrine was granted the title Zhenze in 1105 (Chongning 四). Four years later (Daguang 三), the two deities answered prayers for rain, and, in 1111 (Zhenghe 二), were granted the titles Chonghui zhenren 沖惠眞人 and Chongshu zhenren 沖淑眞人. In the midst of hostilities at the end of the Northern Song and beginning of the Jin, the temple was destroyed, but in 1142 (Huangtong 二) the deities still answered prayers for rain by local people and officials. The temple was then moved to Ling mountain 靈山 in the western part of the county. The shrine was again destroyed in warfare at the end of the Jin but was subsequently repaired after its deities answered prayers for rain by prefectural officials in 1268 (Zhiyuan 五).

2. Chengtang temple 成湯廟. Due to its response to prayers for rain, this temple’s deity was granted the title Jiarun 嘉潤 in 1116 (Zhenghe 二). In 1242, the temple burned down in a wildfire, but later, its temporary complex, which was constructed by the order of Marshal\(^9\) Yan Lingzhen 元帥延陵珍 who controlled

---

\(^8\) A complete chart of references follows the conspectus. The documentation of these temples and their activities is drawn mainly from the published collection of stelae, Shanyou shike congbian 山右石刻叢編, ed. Hu Pinzhi 胡聘之 (Taiyuan: Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 1988). This forty-volume collection contains stelae found throughout Shanxi from the Northern Wei through the Yuan. It was compiled by Hu Pinzhi, a jinshi in 1864 from Tianmen, Hubei, and printed in 1901. For each stele, Hu recorded the stele’s size, number of lines and characters, and its location. Upon publication it was considered one of the finest collections of stelae compiled, a reputation that continues up until today, as it remains one of the most important sources for research on Shanxi.

Yangcheng county 阳城县 at the time, became a place of worship for local officials. In 1288 (Zhiyuan 25), the temple was rebuilt with the assistance of local scholars deemed old and wise under the direction of the posthumous Grand Master for Palace Attendance (zeng zhongfeng dafu 赠中奉大夫) Zheng Maoxiao 郑鼎霄,10 who held the positions of Pacification Commissioner and Chief Military Commander for the Guangdong Circuit (Guangdong dao xuanweishi duyuanshuai 廣東道宣慰使都元帥), Commandery Duke of Gaoping (Gaoping jingong 高平郡公), and Prefect of Binzhou (Binzhou zhizhou 邖州知州). The deity answered prayers for rain in 1304 and 1324, and the temple was repaired in 1317 by District Magistrate (xianyin 縣尹) Han Yanjie 翰延傑. In 1338, prayers for rain were again answered.

3. Lingquan temple 靈泉廟. According to local gazetteers of the Northern Song period, the deity was Douniu 窮ssize=12>ni, a vassal of Zhao Jianzi 趙簡子 of the Spring and Autumn period, and was commonly referred to as the Arranging-Rocks deity (lieshi shen 列石神). This deity was efficacious during times of drought, and the shrine was given the name of Lingquan 靈泉 in 1102 (Congning 1), and the title Yingji hou 英濟侯 was bestowed on the deity in 1107 (Daguang 1). In 1161 (Dating 2), the god answered prayers for rain by local officials and the prefect Shi Chun 史純. In 1347, it answered the prayers for rain by Mangyutemür 忙哥帖木兒, the daruya of Binzhou, who was the son in law of Bilig Temür 鋳 facilitate (mon ayima).

4. Lingyuan gong temple 靈源公廟. The deity here enshrined was a vassal of the Honorable Jing 靖公, who was a distant offspring of Shuyu 叔虞. He was commonly referred to as the Heishui shen 黑水神 (Blackwater deity). During the later Zhou dynasty, in the year 955 (Xuande 2), he was granted the title Jiaying hou 嘉應侯 for responding to drought in the capital. He was granted the additional titles Shanying hou 善應侯 in 1056 (Zhihe 3) and Puze hou 普澤侯 in 1078 (Yuanfeng 1) for answering prayers for rain. Later, during a subsequent drought, two or three shepherds witnessed the appearance of a black snake on the altar in the local temple on Jia Mountain 嘉山. Taking this as the manifestation of a dragon, the people of the prefecture burned incense and offered prayers. That day rain fell. Thereafter, the black snake came to be known as the incarnation of the Heishui deity. During the reign of Huizong 徽宗, it was granted the title Lingyuan gong 靈源公 by petition of the prefect, Zhang Ying 張穎. In 1137 (Tianhui 15), it answered prayers for rain by the prefect Yelu Zhi 耶律志 and the local people. The temple was

10. Translator’s note: The original Japanese article mistakenly rendered this official’s name as Zheng Fu 鄭甫. This error has here been corrected. His name was Zheng Maoxiao.
then moved to the vicinity of the Lingxian temple in the western part of the county. In 1169 (Dading 9), the Blackwater deity responded to rain prayers of the Vice Prefect (tongzhi) Bucha Wuzhong and Assistant (panguan) Wanyan Penggu. In 1304 (Dade 8), the prefect and the people restored the temple. The god again answered prayers by the prefect and the daruya in 1339 (Zhiyuan 5) and 1342 (Zhizheng 2). It also answered the prayers for rain by “the mere commoner” Bai Zhonghe in 1339 (Zhiyuan 5).

5. Lingshan temple. During a time of drought in the Northern Song, six or seven youngsters placed a bottle under cattails growing on a flat rock terrace at the base of Shizi mountain (Lion Mountain). Dew that had dripped from the leaves of the cattail filled the bottle, clouds formed, and the region received ample precipitation. Afterwards, whenever the local villagers placed a bottle under cattails during a time of drought, rain would fall. Thus they built a temple beside the rock terrace and named it the Putai shen (Cattail Terrace deity). In 1104 (Cengning 3), it was entitled Lingdan temple. In 1186 (Dading 26), a stele was erected to record the origin of the deity under the direction of Fan Yu, who belonged to a major lineage of Yangquanli.

6. Jingzhong temple. The deity was Pei Yue, a loyal minister of the later Tang, who died defending his honor in a battle at Ze prefecture. In 1122 (Xuanhe 4), in response to a petition from the Minister of Personnel (libu shangshu), Wang Xiaodi, the deity was granted the title Zhonglie hou, and a temple was built. In 1194 (Mingchang 5), the title granted in 1122 was engraved in stone by the current temple administrator (zhimiao), Guo Jingzhao. The temple was restored during the Zhizheng period (1341–1368).

7. Zhongyong temple. The deity enshrined here was Ma Sui, Prince of Beiping. In 1110 (Daguang 2), he was entitled Yingwu wang and the miracles were recorded in 1201 (Taihe 1) on a stele by the Daoist priest of the shrine and other interested parties. The local villagers worshipped the deity all year round, tirelessly and without fail.

8. Zhaoze wang temple. The deity was a certain figure by the name of Jiao, who was born in the Xuantong reign (860–878) and was said to be a superior Daoist priest. The Northern Song bestowed honors upon him during the Daguang to Xuanhe years (1107–1125), and in the early Jin he was given the title of wang (prince). In 1297 (Dadao 1), eight surrounding villages restored the shrine.
9. Zhongwu wang temple 忠武王廟. The deity was Hun Jian 滬城 of the Tang and often called Run Wang 割王 before an official newly assigned to the post pointed out that he should be called Hun Wang 滬王. He was effective in droughts, and drinking from the spring at the temple healed those who were sick. In 1079 (Yuanfeng 2), he answered prayers for rain four times and was granted the title Zhongwu wang 忠武王. After the fall of the Northern Song, because the title violated a taboo on using the name of an imperial ancestor Hui 徽祖, it was changed in 1156 (Fuchang 6). In 1349 (Zhizheng 9), the temple was repaired by the daruya of the county, and in 1363 (Zhizheng 23), the god answered prayers for rain by Zhu Xizhe 朱希哲, the Branch Central Secretariat for Henan, Jiangbei, and Surrounding Environs (Henan Jiangbei dengchu xingsheng canzhizhengshi 河南江北等處行省參知政事). Later, in response to prayers occasioned by the hostilities between Yuan troops and Red Turban troops in Yichuan county 宜川縣, the god inflicted an epidemic on the Red Turban troops that contributed to the victory of Yuan troops.

10. Jingying temple 靜應廟. The deity enshrined here was Sun Simiao 孫思邈, a Daoist priest of the early Tang. Chongfu monastery 崇福觀 on Wutai mountain 五台山 in Huayuan county 華原縣 was said to be his old retreat, and local medical adepts would gather there for worship. During a drought in 1103 (Congning 2), the deity answered prayers for rain by the magistrate who had seen the local gazetteer of Hui prefecture 蠻州 and came to visit the temple. That same year, he was granted the title Jingying 靜應. The next year, the temple was restored and the deity was granted the additional title Miaoying zhenren 妙應真人. In 1169 (Dading 9), a family from Wansi 萬俟 erected a stele that described repairs undertaken in 1059 (Jiayu 4). Sometime prior to 1218 (Xingling 2) the temple came to be known as Jingming monastery 靜明觀, and received supplications for rain from prefects and county magistrates. In 1245, Ögödei’s second son Köden sent an emissary and offered his blessings. In 1261 (Zhongtong 2) and 1262, Prince Changtong 昌童 gave sequential tax exemptions to the entire temple under the care of abbot Li Suchuan 李素舟. At that time, Jingming temple was promoted in rank to Jingming palace 靜明宮. Afterwards, Jing Deming 井德明, who undertook spiritual training at the palace, gained the favor of several Mongol princes and climbed the ranks of the Daoist bureaucracy. In 1329 (Tianli 2), according to an edict, he was appointed to the rank of the loyal and dependable grand master of Dongyang who manifests the Dao, and concurrently superintendent-in-chief of the

11. Translator’s note: Sun (581–682) was a practitioner of traditional medicine who wrote several tracts and came to be known as the Medicine King 禪王. In the Qing (1644–1911), his hometown near Wutai mountain was renamed Medicine King mountain 禪王山.
circuits (Dongyang xiandao zhongzhen dashi lingzhulu daoqiao dutidian 洞陽顯道忠貞大師領諸路道教都提點).

11. Jingying temple 靜應廟. The deity enshrined here was the Daoist immortal Zi Xu Yuanjun 紫虛元君. In 1104 (Chongning 3), Magistrate Chen Chong 陳崇 of Henei county 河內縣 recognized the immortal’s response to prayers for rain by honoring the temple with the title Jingying temple 靜應廟. In 1117 (Zhenghe 7), the temple was restored after the deity again responded to supplications for rain from the county magistrate. In 1157 (Zhenglong 2), it was restored by local residents. In 1199 (Chengan 4), local residents erected a stele to commemorate the honors bestowed on the temple in 1104. In 1218 (Xingding 2), the deity responded to prayers for rain by local residents, and in 1309 (Zhida 2), residents of Ziling village 紫陵村 to the south-east of the shrine dedicated an offering stand. In 1352 (Zhizheng 12), it was repaired by officials and local residents.

12. Yingrun hou temple 應潤侯廟. Magistrate (zhixian 知縣) Yu Yanhe 禹彥和 applied for honors for the natural spring that worked a miracle during a drought, and in 1199 (Xuanhe 1), it was granted the title of the Yingrun hou. In 1172 (Dading 12), and again in 1188 (Dading 28), the spring responded to prayers for rain by local magistrates. In 1262 (Zhongtong 3), it responded to prayers for rain by Magistrate Liang Tianxiao 梁天翔, who was originally a local warlord in Pingyao county 平遜縣. In 1300 (Dade 4), it again responded to prayers for rain by the county daru.

13. Changning gong temple 昌寧公廟. The deity was Taitai 台骀. Under the later Jin dynasty it was titled Changning gong 昌寧公, and in the Northern Song as Lingying xuanying gong 靈應玄應公, and honored as the Xuanji temple 宣濟廟. In 1194 (Mingchang 5), the temple was repaired under the direction of Assistant Administrator Ren Zhihui 閔官任知徽.

(The table “Conspectus of Temples, Deities, and Sources” on pp. 82–83 summarizes information on the thirteen temples.)

In each of these cases, the enshrined deities were worshipped according to the characteristics and tradition of the particular locality, and thus the development of each of these thirteen temples followed a different path. Furthermore, after the demise of the Northern Song, which had bestowed the titles and honors upon them, some of the temples diminished in status. For example, the stele “Record of the Jingzhong Temple” (Jingzhong miaodie 旌忠廟牒) records the following situation after the granting of the title for the Jingzhong temple (number 6 above):

...
In the Xuanhe 宣和 period (1119–1125), *jinshi* scholar Hao Tianze 浩天澤 obtained an Imperial Certificate [issued by the Northern Song] to preside over the temple. Tianze passed this on to his son Wen 溫, who passed it on to his nephew Zhang Chun 張淳 during the early Dading era (1161–1189). In the twenty-eighth year (1188), at the request of others, Chun passed it on to the Daoist priest Guo Jingzhao 郭景昭. Jingzhao was distressed that the temple had been long neglected and that later generations did not know the original reason for the bestowal of its title.12

The background of this situation is a bit murky. However, it is clear that the certificate granting the title “Jingzhong” to the deity was transmitted quite early to Hao Tianze, and that the administration of the temple remained within his own family until 1188. Afterwards, the certificate came into the hands of the Daoist priest Guo Jinghao, and the specific circumstances of the title were forgotten. Given Guo’s dismay at the lack of patronage, it appears that the temple did not attract many believers from the local population. Furthermore, local officials did not leave any evidence that they might have worshipped there.

Likewise, in the case of the Changning gong temple (number 13), the stele “Record of the Chongning gong Temple” (Changning gong miaoji 昌寧公廟記) relates:

> Although local custom has long transmitted the legacy [of the deity Taitai], it is not known why this is the case. The reason for the temple’s construction was to venerate the Earth God (Tudi shen 土地神). The temple was subsequently destroyed by wind and rain, but no one seemed to care. . . . [In 1194, the assistant administrator Ren Zhiwei 任知徽] obtained the old gazetteer, and together with local scholars Shi Shixiong 史世雄 and Song Yi 宋欽, edited and emended [the description of the temple] to give a full account and thereby enlighten the local villagers. This is the reason why people know that this place should be respected.13

---

12. 10 “Jingchong miaodie” 旌忠廟牒, in *Shanyou*, v. 22. 「宜和間，進士浩天澤得前件黃牒，以主其祠。天澤傳其子進義溫，溫傳其甥張淳。蓋大定初也。至二十八年，淳傳其道士郭景昭。應衆人之請也。景昭病其已湮滅，後人不知始封之由」。

13. “Changning gong miaoji” 昌寧公廟記, in *Shanyou*, v. 23. 「而土俗雖承傳之久，亦不知所以然。又論建祠之由，弟以土地神祀之。故其祠祀為風雨所弊，莫之省也。…乃與儒士史世雄、宋欽取舊圖經，參校編次，增補其闕，具載茲事，以示鄉人。由是民得曉然知所敬是」.
### Conspectus of Temples, Deities, and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMPLE</th>
<th>DEITY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>YEAR OF TITLE BESTOWAL</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 真澤廟</td>
<td>沖惠真入</td>
<td>鵲州壇關縣</td>
<td>賜額：崇寧 4 (1105) 年</td>
<td>宋會要禮 20–63「二女仙祠」，山右 17「真澤廟記」，山右 20「重修二仙廟碑」，山右 25「真澤廟記」，道光壇關縣 志 9「樂氏二真入封號記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>沖淑真入</td>
<td>紫園山</td>
<td>賜號：政和元 (1111) 年</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 成湯廟</td>
<td>嘉潤公</td>
<td>澀州陽城縣</td>
<td>賜號：政和 6 (1107) 年</td>
<td>山右 17「勅嘉潤公記」，莊靖集 8「陽城縣重修聖王廟記」，山右 33「成湯東廟記」，同治陽城縣志 14「重修成湯廟記」，山右 35「湯廟籌雨碑」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>枳城山</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 靈泉廟</td>
<td>寶寳（列石神）</td>
<td>太原府陽曲縣</td>
<td>賜額：崇寧元 (1102) 年</td>
<td>宋會要禮 20–145「列石谷神祠」，山右 20「英後侯感應記」，山右 37「英後侯感應碑」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>賜號：大觀元 (1107) 年</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 靈源公廟</td>
<td>黑水神</td>
<td>平定州嘉山</td>
<td>賜號：至和 3 (1056) 年</td>
<td>山右 20「靈源公廟記」，山右 31「靈源公廟碑」，山右 35「嘉山祈雨記」，山右 35「平定祈雨記」，山右 36「靈源公祈雨記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 靈瞻廟</td>
<td>蒲台神</td>
<td>平定州獅子山</td>
<td>賜額：崇寧 3 (1104) 年</td>
<td>山右 21「靈瞻廟記」，山右 38「靈瞻王廟記」，乾隆平定州志 8「重修豊濟王廟記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 施忠廟</td>
<td>裵約</td>
<td>澀州陽城縣</td>
<td>賜號：宣和 4 (1122) 年</td>
<td>山右 22「施忠廟記」，山右 22「祭裘忠烈公文」，山右 40「重修施忠廟記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>縣城內</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 忠勇廟</td>
<td>馬燧</td>
<td>河中府猗氏縣</td>
<td>賜號：大觀 2 (1108) 年</td>
<td>山右 22「忠勇廟記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 昭澤王廟</td>
<td>魚某</td>
<td>泌州武鄉縣</td>
<td>賜號：大觀「宣和年間」</td>
<td>山右 28「昭澤王事跡銘」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 忠武王廟</td>
<td>渾域</td>
<td>丹州宜川縣</td>
<td>賜號：元豐 2 (1079) 年</td>
<td>宋會要禮 21–56「忠烈王廟」，萃編 138「渾王廟記」，萃編 138「渾王廟碑」，陝西 25「勅祭忠武廟碑」，陝西 26「重修忠武廟碑」，陝西 26「渾忠武王感應碑」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
<td>DEITY</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>YEAR OF TITLE BESTOWAL</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>靜應廟</td>
<td>孫思邈</td>
<td>蘭州華原縣</td>
<td>崇寧 2 (1103) 年</td>
<td>宋會要禮 20–53「孫思邈祠」，萃編 138「孫真元祠記」，萃編 143「靜應廟記」，補遺下「題妙應真元祠」，陝西 25「祭五台山妙應真人文」，陝西 25「孫真元福壽論」，補遺下「靜明宮並加真元號」，陝西 26「井真元道行碑」，補遺下「題妙應真元記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>靜應廟</td>
<td>紫盧元君</td>
<td>懷州河內縣</td>
<td>崇寧 3 (1104) 年</td>
<td>宋會要禮 20–58「靈德夫人祠」，八瓊 124「修紫盧元君殿記」，補正 127「懷州靜應廟額記」，道光河內縣志 21「元紫盧元君廣惠碑」，道 p. 1110「紫盧元君廟地記」，道光河內縣志 21「元靜應廟建供台記」，道 p. 1210「重修紫盧元君靜應廟碑銘」，道光河內縣志 21「元靜應廟界社人名碑」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>應潤侯廟</td>
<td>應潤侯</td>
<td>汾州平遙縣</td>
<td>宜和元 (1119) 年</td>
<td>山右 17「勅賜應潤廟記」，山右 17「超山應潤廟祝文」，山右 17「超山應潤廟碑」，山右 21「應潤廟記」，康熙平遙縣志 21「梁公祈雨靈應記」，山右 29「應潤廟祈雨記」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>昌寧公廟</td>
<td>台駙</td>
<td>寧化州寧化縣定河村</td>
<td>賜號：後晉代，北宋代</td>
<td>山右 23「昌寧公廟記」</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation key: 山右 = 『山右石刻叢編』，萃編 = 『金石萃編』；陝西 = 『陝西金石志』，補遺 = 『陝西金石志補遺』；八瓊 = 『八瓊室金石補正』，補正 = 『金石萃編補正』；道 = 『道家金石略』
Here we find that in the later half of the Jin, people did not know the meaning of an enshrined deity, as expressed by the prefectural assistant administrator who edited and emended the gazetteer.

Such cases are rare, however. Even though each historical case is different, the majority of shrines maintained their influence after the Jin, and the rationales adopted by local officials to justify the selection of deities deserving worship enable us to ascertain methods of local state control. For instance, in the case of the Zhenze temple (number 1), “Record of the Zhenze Temple” (Zhenze miaodie 真澤廟牒) of 1111 (Zhenghe 1) gives the reasons for the bestowal of titles and honors as a “response to prayers” and the “manifestation of hidden powers” so that “people live in peace and are without drought year after year.”14 The stele commemorating the restoration of the two immortals’ temple of 1165 (Dading 5) is even more explicit, offering a concrete miracle as the reason of its reception of titles and honors: sometime in the Chongning 崇寧 era (1102–1107), it provided rations for soldiers who lacked supplies during combat with the Tangut Xixia 西夏 on the Western front.15 The same stele also notes in a biographical sketch a number of other details: the older of the two female immortals, Chonghui 沖惠, shared the same birthday with the Buddha; the manner in which the goddesses rose to immortal status; and the benefits available to those who prayed at the shrine, which included the alleviation of illness and the delivery of worthy sons or beautiful daughters to those seeking children. It also records instances in which the deities responded to prayers for rain. This lore spread quickly in the Northern Song, and the following description from the same stele provides a rich description of a branch temple in the Jin.

A hundred years prior [in the Huangtong 皇統 period (1141–1149)], in Lingxi village 嶺西莊, Linchuan county 陵川縣, Zhang Zhi’s 張志 mother, née Qin 秦氏, was washing clothes in Dongnan gully 東南澗 [near her home] when two women appeared dressed in red and wearing caps of phoenix feathers. In an

---


15. The honoring of the two immortals was in 1111 (Zhenhe 1). However, in related documents from the Zhenhe period, there is no mention of any miracles prior to those of the Chongning era (1102–1107). See “Chongxiu erxianmiao bei” 重修二仙廟碑, in Shanyou, v. 20. 「至宋崇寧年間，曾顯靈於辯戍。西夏弗靖，久屯軍旅，闔於糧餉，轉輸艱阻。忽二仙女獻飯救度，錢無多寡，皆令饗飽。飯饋雖小，不竭。所取軍將欣躍。二仙遭遇，驗實帥司，經略奏舉。于時取旨，銜輪褒賞，遂加封沖惠沖淑賢人，廟號真澤」.
austere manner they disappeared to the south of the gully. That night she had a vision in her dream that said, “The ones that you saw in red were my sister and I, who are two immortals. If your family builds a temple on the spot where we appeared, your descendents will flourish and prosper.” Thereupon, Qin and her son Zhi built a temple to the south of the gully, and every spring and fall without fail she would offer sacrifice. From then on the family fortunes increased and their productive lands reached several tens of qing [17 acres] that reaped several thousand dou [1.5 gallons] of grain; their savings increased to several million, and their offspring grew to more than a hundred dependents. . . . [In 1142 (Huang-tong 2)], Zhang Zhi’s son, Quan 欄, his nephew, Juyuan 舉愿, and others offer respectful prayer and are mindful of the foundation laid by their ancestors. And thus they led the locality in restoring the temple.

Judging from this passage, it appears that after the erection of the branch temple south of the gully, the Zhang family prospered under the divine patronage of the two immortals. The lineage probably used the two immortals as ostensible justification to preserve their power in local society, for the authorization of a branch temple by the dynasty as an official place of worship would have been a highly effective means of legitimation. In short, this stele highlights a deity’s patronage of a lineage, and at the same time it expresses the interest of the Zhang family in the branch temple. Indeed, the family may very well have encouraged reports of miracles of the two immortals in order to further raise the authority of the branch temple.

The creative input and influence of the Zhang family was not, however, the deciding factor in transmitting the legend and promoting the shrine’s efficacy.

16. “Chongxiu erxian miaobei” 重修二仙廟碑, in Shanyou, v. 20. 「先是百年前，陵川縣嶺西莊張志母親秦氏，因浣衣於东南澗，見二女人服純紅衣，鳳冠，儼然至澗南弗見。夜見夢曰，『汝前所睹紅衣者，乃我姊妹二仙也。汝家，立廟於化現處，令汝子孫蓄富』。秦氏因與子志創建廟于澗南，春秋祭祀不怠。自爾家道自興，良田至數十頃，積穀至數千斛，聚錢至數百萬，子孫眷屬至百餘口。⋯ 張志子權與子姪舉元等，敬奉神意，又不忘祖父背基。乃率諭鄉縣，增修澗南之廟」。

17. Those worshiping deities without official recognition would be severely punished if caught. For example, we have a case in early Dading period (1160–1189)—twenty years after the repair of the south gully branch temple—where all of the practitioners of an unauthorized worship in the neighboring county of Shangdang were to be executed. This is recorded on the stele “shi shao zhong bei” 史少中碑, in Lanlan laoren fushui wenji, v. 12. 「近年，居嶺州。上党一愚人以財雄一方，率數村之民九十人，迎西齊王，以賽秋社，儀衛之物，頗僭制度。利其財者，構成其罪，縣獄具聞于州，州將亦武弁，有覬覦之心，欲糾誅之。公獨慷慨，別白其事，州將不能奪，竟全千人之命」.
Given the concreteness of the miracles and legends of the two immortals, there is a high probability that the author of the stele, Zhao Anshi 趙安時, Grand Master of Palace Leisure (zhongsan dafu 中散大夫) and Assistant Commander-in-Chief of Vanguard Infantry and Cavalry in the Nanjing Circuit (qian Nanjinglu bingma duzongguan panguan 前南京路兵馬都總管判官), who was also from Lingchuan county, was personally familiar with stories circulating at the time. Nonetheless, from this case, we can understand the development of the authority of the Zhenze shrine, as well as the origin of faith in the two immortals.

A similar case is the comparatively recent deity of Lingshan temple (number 5), which was originally constructed near a stone terrace, and which was no larger than a small shrine. After the temple was entitled in 1186 (Dading 26), Fan Yu 范宇, a member of one of the major families in the village, composed a stele inscription that read, “Although the facts of the Cattail Terrace deity are recorded in the Jinyang 晉陽 gazetteer and are transmitted orally by the elders, it is sketchy and prone to distortion.” (This indicates that there was a record of it in the Jinyang gazetteer.) Insofar that this temple was documented in gazetteers or other official records, we can assume that it was a recognized official place of worship.

Later, in 1353 (Zhizheng 13), the following stele was made:

On the fourth day of the fourth month, the temple holds a festival, and on the day before the festival it holds a ritual to welcome the deity. Everyone from the six villages carry insignias displayed on streamers, pennants, and canopies; flags, banners, cymbals, drums, music, and revelry come out one after another in succession. This is called arousing the deity.

This is to say, the festival of the Cattail Platform deity, which began with the

---


20. At least it was the case that in the Northern Song those temples recorded in gazetteers were taken as having become the basis upon which the shrine made claims to authority. See Mizukoshi, “Sōdai shakai to shibyo shinkō no tenkai,” 12.

21. “Lingshan wang miaobei” 靈薦王廟碑 in Shanyou, v. 38. 四月四日，□亨廟上，前期一日迎神。六村之衆具儀仗，引導幡轎寶蓋，旌旗金鼓與散樂社火層見疊出。名曰起神。
placing of a bottle under cattails, developed over two centuries so that by 1353 (Zhizheng 13) it had become the practice of six villages to communally welcome dieties every year on the third day of the fourth month.\(^{22}\)

**Differences between the North and South**

The bringing of rain and healing of the sick were common supernatural occurrences, which in turn put countless miracle-producing temples in competition for patronage. It seems likely that the reason temples did not die out but maintained their wide influence in the local community—and even expanded it at times—was due to the Jin and Yuan dynastic policy of granting titles and honors to the temples. In the past few decades, much research has been undertaken on religious practices in the south under the Song and Yuan. Scholars such as Valerie Hansen, Sue Takashi 須江隆, and Mizukoshi Tomo 水越知 have shown the reorganization of power among temples and deities. Their conclusions emphasize the localist turn in the twelfth century, which was manifest in religious policy with the granting of titles and honors gradually shifting to the initiative of local society. As such, we see that in South China under the Southern Song, the hierarchy of worship came to be reconstructed according to the relative efficacy of the temples. Research on the south by these scholars shows that as cults expanded, local magistrates granted titles in order to cooperate with local elites, and the dynasty began to attempt to standardize cults in order to maintain control.\(^{23}\)

\(^{22}\) Of the cases here explored, the Jingying shrine (number 10) gives us the clearest example of a shrine’s evolution—in the Yuan it came to have the protection of several Mongol princes. It should be noted, however, that that shrine had been built in a Daoist monastery before its entitlement, and it seems that it expanded its authority as a part of a Daoist cult rather than by gaining wide power over the Daoist groups to which it was attached. Therefore, it cannot be taken as another case of the same nature.

This is not a thesis that can explain North China, however. If there was a rise and fall of cults based on the locality and a deity’s efficacy in the north, then the documentary record simply does not exist. Of all the contemporary materials available to us, including the hundreds of stelae, there is nothing on changing gods in the north. Unlike the south, the northern dynasties did not put new deities and temples on their official registers and statutes and did not give them honors and titles. Furthermore, the record shows that only with state legitimization could a cult expand—there is nothing to indicate that a local cult flourished without support of the state. Therefore, given the evidence that we have, it appears that there was a different religious landscape in the north. As seen in the aforementioned thirteen cases of deity worship and enshrinement, the deities performing miracles and bestowed with honors and titles were only those already extant in the registers and statutes. There is no evidence that new more efficacious deities emerged to replace old ones. On the contrary, previous deities had to be resurrected to perform miracles and then granted with further honors and titles. It is not too far fetched to say that Jin and Yuan religious policy restricted the development of new cults and temples.

In short, the north and south were different. The application system for honors and titles of the Southern Song did not exist in North China under the Jin and Yuan, where there was essentially no chance for a small temple worshipped only in a specific county to receive new honors or titles. Indeed, there were very few cases in the north where a temple authorized by the dynasty came under threat from a local temple in competition for patronage. The proactive dynastic temple policy of the Jin and Yuan in the north made challenges to the authority of officially sanctioned temples extremely rare—in comparison with the south where titles and honors were granted regularly at

Local Religion, and Models of Divinity in Sung and Modern China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002). It should be noted that although Hymes’ two-tier model of bureaucratic and personal deities may at first glance appear to work for developments in the north, for reasons laid out here, the evidence we have for the north does not fit this model. An explanation of this difference goes beyond just sources—as a comparison of additions to the sidian for both north and south highlight the different trends—and to the heart of social and political developments in each region—in short, the localist turn of the south did not occur to the same effect in the north, where the state continued to maintain a strong presence and gave no room for the rise and spread of new cults. Furthermore, warfare allowed local elite to play a larger role in government, with many becoming officials in their locality during hostilities (see below).]
the behest of local magnates. In fact, in contrast to the south, materials relating
to the temples discussed above almost always gave special mention to their
honors granted in the Northern Song, or to their entries in official register
books or local gazetteers. It thus becomes apparent that such recognition was
met with great respect by residents of the locality. This is evident in the case
of the shrine of Changning gong (number 13), which illustrates the authority
of an authorized temple and its growth in popularity as a result of dynastic
recognition. The temple was mentioned in the local gazetteer by local offi-
cials, and as the people of Dinghe village 定河村 in Ninghua county 寧
化縣 were informed of the heritage of this backwoods temple they came to
“know that this place should be respected.”

At this point we must ask why successive local officials continued to worship
shrines that had received honors and titles from a previous dynasty. We can
begin to approach an answer to this question by looking at the role of local
officials and how they were expected to perform, both by their superiors and
their constituents. From one angle, we know that in a manner similar to their
counterparts in the south, local officials in the north also had to recognize
objects of worship, either by granting new honors and titles or by observing
the ones already existent. Given the proactive religious policy of the Jin and
Yuan described above, an important part of the duties of a local official in
this period was to lead the annual worship observances for the Altar of Soil
and Grain, the Sage Confucius, and the deities of wind, rain, and thunder,
as well as to offer prayer in times of drought and during natural disasters. All
this meant identifying the appropriate objects of worship for the necessary
sacrifices.

The necessity and the importance of the magistrate’s lead in official ritual
can be seen through a number of examples. During the drought of 1162
(Dading 2), an administrative clerk of Yangqu county 陽曲縣 chastised his
magistrate, Shi Chun 史純, in an attempt to convince him to offer prayers
for rain at the Lingquan Shrine (number 3): “You are the head of a county
seat, and here is an efficacious deity. How can you sit there idly while people
perish and not pray?” Another example comes in the form of a compliment
paid in 1339 (Zhiyuan 5) to the prefect of Pingding 平定州, surnamed Zhang

24. See note 11 above.
25. “Yingji gong ganyingji” 英濟公感應記, Shanyou, v. 20. 「子為邑長，此有靈神。何
不祈禱，豈忍而坐視生民殞耶？」
張, in light of the response to his prayers for rain: “You Sir, your sincerity is comparable to that of the former worthies. In your governing of the people, your administrative acts are just, your pronouncements reasonable, trouble is kept to a minimum, and the population is at peace. In serving the gods, propriety is maintained, correct attire worn, and the rites are observed. It is thus that the gods are moved by your sincerity and repay it with favor.” By giving such commendation here to this official for his orderly governance and religious practice in peaceful times, we can deduce that when faced with natural disaster, officials were expected to offer prayers and sacrifice. (Given the existence of statutes and worship records extolling the moral probity of Jin and Yuan officials, we can make generalizations about their requirements and behavior, and need not question the individual dispositions of local officials, or the anomaly of the locality as recorded in Jin and Yuan literary compositions, epigraphs, and other sources.)

Furthermore, local officials in the north under the Jin and Yuan continued to rely on official register books and gazetteers of the locality, indicating that they adopted wholesale the ritual practices established in the Northern Song. This is apparent from the continued reference of liturgical practice from the Jin—we find descriptions such as the one for the Lingquan temple (number 3) that read, “Even now [1162, Dading 2], sacrifice is still offered in accordance with the official registers (sidian),” as well as in stelae commemorating the restoration of the Changning gong temple (number 13) and the revision of old gazetteers by the magistrate. In addition, a consistent and continuous register-based worship system could be maintained in the north under the Jin and the Yuan because the granting of titles and honors was rare, whereas the Southern Song’s frequent granting of titles and honors to new deities created a disparity between the worship of deities in the official registers (sidian) and the actual practice of worship. In short, the dynastic policy of the Jin and Yuan regarding worship made adherence to precedent a natural choice for local officials.

In this section, I have examined a focused selection of local temples that were granted honors and titles in the Northern Song, and for which we have

26. “Jiashan qiyu ji” 嘉山祈雨記 in Shanyou, v. 35. 「公致感之誠，殆無間於前賢。其治民也，政平詞理，事簡民安。其事神也，齋明盛服，以承祀事。故神感是誠，惠然而來」。

relevant materials from the Jin and Yuan. I have further laid out trends in the respective localities, as well as the actions of local officials. From this I have been able to show that the granting of honors and titles by the Northern Song established a stable authority for shrines in local society and established precedents followed by local officials of the Jin and Yuan. This generated a religious landscape in the Jin and Yuan vastly different from that of the Southern Song.

In the next section I will take up the case of the Yingrun hou temple (number 12) and consider the position of local officials involved in temple rituals and how this relates to aspects of their local administration. The reason for looking at one temple in detail is that the specifics we have on its restoration and the granting of its title illustrate the phenomenon of the state single handedly re-introducing a local deity back into society and its gaining of popularity based on official patronage. Furthermore, the relationship between local society and local officials exhibited here presents an extremely lucid case of successive officials’ estimation of their predecessors and thereby offers insights into the character of their local administration.

*The Yingrun hou temple and continuity in local governance*

Details of the designation of the Yingrun hou temple have been recorded in the decree “Chici Yingrun miaoji” 敕赐應潤廟記 of 1119 (Xuanhe 1):

Fifty *li* south of the prefectural seat there is a mountain called Chaoshan 超山. Its shape is tall and wide; it overlooks the city. From the mountainside bluff a spring gushes forth. At the source of the spring is just a scoop of water but its taste is always cool, refreshing, and of a smooth sweetness. According to legends handed down by the elders, praying there in a drought year will never go without a favorable response. When Yanhe 彦和 was an examination official here, there was drought in spring and summer for two consecutive years. He led sacrifices three times, and each time the response always came like an echo. . . . Even though Yanhe fully reported the facts to the prefect, several consecutive applications ended in deadlock and failed to be enacted [i.e. the temple was not approved by the dynasty for a title]. It then happened that Marquis Zhou 周侯 took command of the territory. He acted as the father and mother of the people and never allowed their desires to go unheeded. Accordingly, Yanhe again
made another submission of the facts to Marquis Zhou, who then applied to the court, and in due course the shrine was awarded with the designation Yingrun (responding with moisture).  

“Yanhe,” who put in the request for a grant of designation, was the magistrate of Pingyao county at the time, and his name and title are inscribed in full at the end same decree: “Yu Yanhe 余彥和, holding the rank of xuanjiao lang 宣教郎, administrator of Pingyao county in Fen prefecture 汾州, and director of school affairs (guanju xueshi 管句學事).” “Marquis Zhou” is Zhou Wei 周煒, who was the Prefect of Fenzhou at the time, and whose name and title were recorded in the heading of juan /one.oldstyle/seven.oldstyle of “Chaoshan Yingrunmiao zhuwen” 超山應潤廟祝文 in Shanyou, which was erected as a stele in 1120 (Xuanhe 2), and which reads, “Zhou Wei, by rank zhongfeng dafu 中奉大夫, Administrator of Fenzhou Command and Prefecture (zhi Fenzhou junzhou 知汾州軍州), supervising the Divine Empyrean Yuqing Wanshou Palace (Shenxiao Yuqing Wanshou gong 神霄玉清萬壽宮), Director of School Affairs (guanju xueshi 管句學事), Concurrently Inner Advisor to Agriculture (lianguan neiquan nongshi 兼管內勤農使), Concurrently Inspector of Horse Pasturage (lian dianjian mumashi 兼點檢牧馬事), and endowed with the Purple Gilt Fish Purse (jie cijin yudai 借紫金魚袋).”

As for the deity worshipped as Yingrun hou, the heading of the decree “Chaoshan Yingrun miaochi” 超山應潤廟敕, which was also set up as a stele in 1120 (Xuanhe 2), reads, “The scriptural record bears no references to the surname or lineage of the deity of the Yingrun temple at Chaoshan.” This indicates that the background of the deity was unclear from the time of its entitlement. This is a bit strange, for generally speaking, Jin and Yuan records on such matters provide etiologies of an enshrined deity. However, in the case of Yingrun hou, nothing was given, not even the deity’s personal name. This was not normal for a temple that attracted the worship of a significant number of believers, and even less so for a small shrine that did not have much influence in its region before entitlement.

---

28. “Chici Yingrun miaoji” 敕賜應潤廟記, in Shanyou, v. 17. "邑之南五十里有山焉。名曰超山。勢高且厚，下視邑城。山之巖有泉出焉。源雖微濁，嘗其味清涼而滑甘。耆老相傳，歲遇旱，禱於茲，未嘗不應。彥和試吏茲邑，連二歲春夏旱，率三禱，皆應如讖。⋯彥和具以事狀白郡守，前後對再請皆飽飽不克行。及周侯領是邦也，父母其民，民之所欲，無不從之。於是，彥和再狀其事于周侯，即請於朝，埜錫以應潤名”。
At the time of applying for a title and honors, the Fiscal Commissioner (zhuanyun shi 轉運使) and others undertook numerous investigations and verified the truth of the miracles. For the case of Yingrun hou, the “Record of the imperial bestowal of the Yingrun temple” offers this account: “Even though Yanhe fully reported the facts to the prefect, several consecutive applications ended in deadlock and failed to be enacted.” That the application was not approved strongly suggests that in the investigations the temple was initially found to be not in compliance with the standards according to which a deity would receive official recognition, which at the time were based primarily on the popularity of the god. Indeed, given the emperor’s encouragement to approve all applications for popular deities that had influence in the locality, we can deduce that a miracle-performing deity that attracted local worshipers by dint of its efficacy simply did not exist in the case of Yingrun hou.²⁹

The following communication from the Board of Rites in 1101 (Jianzhong jingguo 1) illustrates the rationale for Yu Yanhe’s application.

The Board of Rites herewith states: In the conferral of accreditation for deities and temples in the provinces, there have been many cases that do not meet the specified guidelines. Today we must point out that according to the regulations all deities and shrines that repeatedly respond to prayers with miracles, where meritorious benefits are bestowed on people, where the actual evidence is manifest, and in which it becomes incumbent to grant official rank and bestow the temple with titles and honors,³⁰ the prefectures and counties must present the facts of the situation to the Fiscal Commission, who will then verify and submit a warranted memorial. We will proceed according to the ruling.³¹

²⁹ Translator’s note: Emperor Huizong encouraged commissioners to approve applications liberally so that he might have spiritual jurisdiction over religious practice and belief. The rejection of the deity during this period would thus point to the lack of the deity’s influence in the locality. However, the subsequent approval of the application may be explained by a new official’s greater willingness to more liberally accord with this policy, as discussed below. See Asaf Goldschmidt, “Emperor Huizong and the Divine Empyrean Palace Temple network,” in Emperor Huizong and Late Northern Song China: The Politics of Culture and the Culture of Politics, ed. Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Maggie Bickford (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006); Matsumoto, “Sōdai no Shigaku Shigō nitsuite”; Sue, “Tōsōki niokeru shibyō no byōgaku hōgō no kashi nisuite,” 108–110.

³⁰ Mizukoshi reads this as “granting titles and honoring the temple.” (“封号廟額” instead of “封廟號額”) See Mizukoshi Tomo, “Sōdai shakai to shibyo shinkō no tenkai,” 7.

³¹ Songhuiyao jigao 宋會要輯稿, li 禮 20.7. 「禮部言，諸州神祠加封多有不應條
Given the solicitation of reports of widespread miracles from local officials beginning in 1050 (Huangyou 2), which led to an increase in the number of titles and honors granted, the quoted communication appears to have been part of a greater trend in the reorganization of a policy regarding temple worship. This indicates that Yu Yanhe’s request conformed to the dynasty’s contemporary religious policy.

We therefore find that the basis for granting a title to the Chaoshan temple was not a matter of persuading the authorities of the god’s efficacy. Why, then, was the title granted in the end? The answer probably has something to do with the reign during which the title was granted—Huizong (1100–1126), who among all Northern Song rulers oversaw the greatest number of deity and temple entitlements. We can adduce various causative factors for this phenomenon, such as a relaxation in rigidity of the application and certification system for titles and honors corresponding to a decline in the political power of the Song, a display of imperial power in local society, the emperor’s desire to exert control over spiritual affairs, and the return to political power of the New Policies faction (Xinfadang 新法黨), which took a proactive stance in temple designations. The fact that there was a period in which the dynasty easily granted honors and titles is certain, and it is probably not a gross error to say that the granting of a title to Yinrunhou is also a reflection of this.

In the ninth month of the first year of the Jingkang reign 靖康 (1126), Jin troops attacked Pingyao county; when it fell they committed mass slaughter in the county seat. The Huanglujiao ceremony 黃霧醮 [a Daoist memorial service for the dead] performed in 1134, 1137, and 1141 in the Qingxu monastery.  

令。今欲參酌舊制，諸神祠所禱累有靈應，功德及人，事跡顯著，宜加官爵封廟號額者，州具事狀申轉運司，本司驗實，即具保奏。…准此從之】。Morita Kenji 森田憲司, “Bunshō teikun no seiritsu: chihōshin kara kakyo no kami e” 文昌帝君の成立: 地方神から科挙の神へー, in chūgoku kinsei no toshi to bunka (Kyō: Kyōto daigaku jingenkagaku kenkyūsho, 1984).

34. See "Zonghan zhuan" 宗翰傳, in Jinshi 金史, v. 74 '九月丙寅，宗翰克太原，執宋經略使張孝純等。儖沙虎取平遼，降藁石、介休、孝義諸縣'.
清虚觀，where the bones of approximately 4,450 people were collected, gives us a glimpse of the large scale suffering inflicted on Pingyao during the Jurchen conquest. During this time, the Yingrun hou temple remained the focus of prayers for rain by local officials. Thus we find the “Yingrun miaoji” recording of 1188 (Dading 28):

In 1119 (Xuanhe 1), Magistrate Yu Yanhe reported by formal submission that rain had fallen in response to prayer. A title was thus granted in the name of Yingrun temple. The decree and the stele still exist. This was seventy years ago. In 1172 (Dading 12), Magistrate Lan Siji also prayed for rain and was answered. He subsequently built the Xiyu pavilion on the premises of the county offices as proof of the effectiveness of Yingrun. Recently, in spring and summer, the rains have not come as expected, causing the budding crops to wither and the people to fall ill. For the sake of the people, His Honor Lord Kou, administrative aide and acting county administrator (zhicheng quanxian), walked to Yingrun temple at Chaoshan and drew water and prayed for rain. Because the temple facade was crumbling and the old altar and hall were in ruin, in his prayer he said that if granted rain he would donate funds for the restoration of the entire shrine complex. When he spoke thus, his faith induced a reaction that prompted thunder.

His Honor Lord Kou had the courtesy name Boxiang and came from Jun county in Dai prefecture. In the spring of 1185 (Dading 25), he came to our county as an assistant administrator in provisional charge of county affairs (chengwuyi tequanxian). Judgments did not lag, prisoners did not languish in jails, villages were spared abusive deputies, and bandits did not roam the region. All was tranquil without disruptive incidents. He further enlarged the administration, restored schools and study halls, re-thatched the southern hall of string music and song, and extended the canal to the eastern suburbs. He completed neglected tasks, and the common people all followed because he governed with honesty. When he was promoted and transferred to a new appointment, literati and commoners came out to praise him. Still more, in his moving the gods to make it rain, he has surpassed His Honor Yu and Magistrate Lan.
Here we can see clearly the circumstances of prayers for rain in 1172 (Dading 12) and 1188 (Dading 28), and that worship at the Yingrun hou temple continued under the Jin despite its founding in the Northern Song. It is noteworthy that the moral probity of this certain Kou of the Jin can be compared to Yu Yanhe of the Northern Song. Indeed, although the Northern Song was a different dynasty at a different time, the locality in question not only remembered the previous dynasty’s officials, but also drew on their moral righteousness in order to validate that of contemporary officials.

This was especially the case in the subsequent era, when, in the spring of 1211 (Da’an 3), Chinggis Khaan began to invade the Jin, and Northern China once again went through a time of upheaval. As far as we are able to determine from extant documents, two ethnic Han military cliques arose in Pingyao county: the Liang 梁 family and the Du 杜 family. Liang Ying 梁瑛, who was head of the Liang family, surrendered to Grand Preceptor Prince of State (taishi guowang 太師國王) Muqali in 1218 and was given command as Marshal Left Army Supervisor (yuanshui zuo jianjun 元帥左監軍). He later fought in battles in various locations in support of Mongol forces. On the other side, Du Feng 杜豐, head of the Du family, originally aligned with the “righteous brigade” of the Jin, but then committed himself to the Mongol side immediately following the fall of Taiyuan 太原 in 1218. The actual relationship between these two families remains unclear. However,
the author of Liang Ying’s spirit tablet was Du Feng’s third son, Sijing思敬, which suggests that their relationship was friendly.39

By late Jin and early Yuan, it appears that Pingyao had come under control of the Liang family. We know that in 1235 Du Feng held office in Mizhou 淄州 as chief administrator, which would have given the Liang family complete political and social control over Pingyao.40 Furthermore, a stele erected to commemorate a visit to Pingyao in 1237 of the Quanzhen sect’s 全真教 sixth patriarch 六代掌教, Master Qinghe 清和子 Yin Zhiping 尹志平, incidentally documents the names of Liang Yu 梁瑜 as the Pingyao County Chief (changguan 長官), Liang Yin 梁瑛 as receiving appointment as the Battalion Commander of the Taiyuan Circuit (xuanshou Taiyuan lu mingan 宣授太原路明安梁瑛), and Liang Guannu 梁官奴 as the ex-daruja.41 This indicates that the Liang family held all the senior positions in Pingyao at the time and would likely have also held the daruja post.

Liang Ying died in 1256, whereupon his fourth son, Tianxiang 天翔, inherited control of Pingyao. Having practiced reading and writing from his youth, Tianxiang was conversant in Mongolian and had embarked on a career in administrative office.42 During the drought of 1262 (Zhongtong 3) he offered prayers for rain at the Yingrun hou temple, which were recorded as follows:

39. In 1235, the sixth patriarch of the Quanzhen sect, Yin Zhiping, who received Du Feng’s application for office, held a ceremony in Pingyao, where both the Liang and Du families are recorded worshiping at the various temples, thus giving evidence of their coexistence. See “Qingheyan daoxuande zhenrenxianji zhi bei” 玄門掌教清和妙道廣化真人尹宗師碑銘并序, in Ganshuixianquan lu 甘水仙源錄, v. 3.


41. “Qinghezhengren zhenxiang zhi ji” 清和真人性像之記, in Pingyao gucheng xiancun lidai beiji jilu 平遙古城現存歷代碑記輯錄 (Pingyao: Pingyaoxian weiyanhui wenshi shiliao, 2000), p. 115–116. The same stele can be found at the Qingxu monastery in Pingyao, 平遙縣清虛觀.

42. See “Yuangu shaozhongdafu xishusichuan daoju zhengqian fangshi lianggong shendao beiming,” 元故中大夫西蜀四川道肅政廉訪使梁公神道碑銘, in Shanyou, v. 31. 公生而卓異，未冠能樹立讀書，通大義。弧矢之妙絕一時，尤邃國言。家素武弁，獨以文階起。歲丙辰，尹正遙。時公年十有八。克自振奮，有夙成風。每召邑老十余輩，禮以酒食，詢以民事。衆老皆日可，而後行。
The court’s virtuous official [Liang Tianxiang] first took up the position of magistrate of Pingyao in the spring of 1262. That summer and fall, a severe drought struck. He prayed for rain at the sacred shrines throughout the county, but to no avail. Someone proposed Yingrun, and he led elders to the site. Upon offering gifts of money and invocations, they ascended the altar, at which time thunder rolled and lightning flashed. Before the incense had burned out, propitious rain poured down in floods and inundated the county.

I must remark that early in the Xuanhe era (1199–1216), the court bestowed a temple placard as honor and reward. In this way, the efforts initiated by Lord Yu and prefect Marquis Zhou were realized. Towards the middle of the Dading era (1411–1416) of the Jin, magistrate Lan Siji and associate Kou Juqing both prayed for rain and were answered. In order to honor the miracle, they set up a new temple. To this day the steles are preserved in their entirety.

The situation is that the tenure of our prefect [Liang Tianxiang] proceeded entirely from the lineage code. And yet from the beginning of his term he governed benevolently by using assets to benefit the people; he is still praised today. On the subject of his governing, he built schools to promote local culture, dug canals to irrigate peoples’ fields, and petitioned on behalf of the people. In pointing all of this out, it is regrettable that a complete statement cannot be retained. . . . That he has mastered the way to serve the deities and govern the people can be called perfection.43

The Liang family skillfully utilized prayers for rain as a mechanism of legitimacy that connected them not only to the locality’s immediate needs, but also to its recent past. Given that it was not until the Yuan, in 1270 (Zhiyuan 2), that the provincial regulations for ritual and sacrifice were set and the Court of Imperial Granaries (sinong si司農司) established, it appears that the Liang family performed rain prayers on their own authority and paid for it themselves. In doing so, we see from the quoted records that the Yingrun hou temple maintained its position as a site of worship in the Yuan despite

43. “Lianggong qiyu lingying ji” [梁公祈雨靈應記, in “yunwenzhi”芸文志, in Kangxi Pingyao xianzhi, v. 11.朝列公當中統壬戌之春，初仕為平遙令，夏暨秋旱甚。公歷簿繇縣界靈祠，卒無所獲。有以應潤為言者，乃率父老詣焉。幣祝甫登，雷電電明，香火未収，甘雨洪注，均雨縣境。…雖惟，宣和之初，朝廷賜額褒賞之。意實自邑宰佘君與郡守周侯啓之。顏金之大定中，離尹嗣吉，寇丞君慶俱以祈雨有應，而能尊明靈作新廟。今石刻具存。況我侯，洪官一出于家法。方初仕，有仁民利物之政，今猶領之。如宰介美，則立縣學以勵風俗，開渠水以溉民田，及代民陳五事。並舉之，訥以不得留潤為恨。…由是觀之，則事神治民之道，可謂備至矣】
having its title awarded under duress in the Northern Song and being used by Jin officials. The historical reach of the text as well as the oral transmission of the success of Pingyao should also be noted, all of which touch on the rain prayers of previous generations. This put Liang Tianxiang into direct comparison with his administrative predecessors, showing his moral virtue to be not inferior. Also, given that local officials performed rain rituals in the same manner, Liang was clearly connected to the lineage of previous administrators of Pingyou. In short, the rain prayer provided a good opportunity for the Liang family to clearly display the power of their control in Pingyao.

In the second month of 1261 (Zhongzong 3), however, several months before Liang Tianxiang performed his rain prayers, the Li Tan 李紳 rebellion broke out in Yidu 益都, Shandong. A half a year later, Li Tan was killed and the rebellion came to an end.\(^4\) However, the rebellion led to a visible reduction in the power of the Han military cliques, and Liang Tianxiang lost control of Pingyao. The position of the office of the local official itself did not change, however, and we have records of the daruyá of Pingyao, Wanyan 完顔 Deitemūr, performing rain prayers at the temple during a drought in 1300 (Dade 4). The “Yingrunmiao qiyu ji” 應潤廟祈雨記 details Wanyan Deitemūr’s practice as follows:

He was distressed that drought had stricken the year, and he thus restored the rain altar and built an earthen dragon. He made rounds to pray to all deities in the county but did not receive a single response. He subsequently asked the elders, who told him of Yingrun hou at Chaoshan. That day he fasted and abstained and set off for the sacred mountain to call on the deity. With the solemnity of burning incense and the utmost sincere devotion he abandoned himself to worship. In an instant, rainclouds converged from all four directions and deluges of rain poured down like rivers. After five days, he offered animal sacrifice and libations in gratitude and honor. Rain again promptly inundated the entire county. Consequently, wheat and sorghum were in abundance, plants and trees flourished, and the fall brought a plentiful harvest.\ldots Without his sincerity (cheng 誠) we would not have been able to receive the deity’s miraculous response. Such interaction with the netherworld consists of contact through sincere intention (chengyì 誠意). In the past, the magistrate of Shehong 射洪, Zhang Yong 張雍, known as Shixun 土遜, prayed to the deity of the white cliff in times of drought—and it would promptly rain. Shixun would remain until the rain was

\(^4\) “Lianggong qiyu zhengying ji.”
sufficient and then leave. The people of Sichuan found this extraordinary. Our Wanyan praying to the deity at Chaoshan and rain promptly falling, how is this different from Shixun?45

Without explicit comparison to officials of previous dynasties, the example of Zhang Shixun of the Northern Song was discussed so as to equate virtue with the contemporary official of the Yuan. Of course this has the implication that the virtue of previous administrators could not possibly be in question. Similarly, Wanyan Deitemür was not uninfluenced by precedent. Afterwards, the Yingrun hou temple continued to increase its influence, and in 1706 (Kangxi 45) it reached the point of having three branch temples in the county.46 Based on the documentary evidence available, there are no traces that indicate rain prayers were offered at temples other than Yingrun hou in Pingyao during the Jin and Yuan.

This section has made some observations on the case of the Yingrun hou temple. When the Northern Song granted it titles and honors, the Chaoshan spring did not exist as anything more than an object of seasonal prayer for local residents. The designation that it achieved was not bestowed on account of its miraculous effects, but rather occasioned by the historical circumstances of the Huizong reign. Following this designation and transformation into the object of rain supplications by local officials, the spring came to be widely recognized throughout the county. That recognition became even stronger when Jin local officials chose Yingrun hou as the site for rain prayers, and precedents thereby accumulated. Under the Mongols, the actions taken at the time of drought by local resident Liang Tianxiang suggest that the Yingrun hou temple had become widely known as an object of rain prayer. Local officials of successive periods continued to act according to precedent. Even through prolonged wars and the change of dynasties, the position of

45. “Yingrunmiao qiyu ji” 應潤廟祈雨記, in Shanyou, v. 19.『以歲旱為懼，於是修勇祀作土龍，邇諸縣內神祠備之，輒無一應，遂詢耆老，有以超山應潤侯言者。公是日齋戒，躬詣靈山謁神宇，聞香火極誠敬暴身致禱，不旋踵而元雲四合，洪雨河注。越五日，公以牲醴用答神賜，輒又雨均浹縣境。于是二陵舒澤，草木滋茂，秋遂大稔。…非公之誠，則不能感神之應。幽明既交，是誠意接矣。昔張雍士遜為射洪令，遇歲旱，禱白崖神，即雨。士遜立，須雨足，乃去。蜀人異之，公完顏六禱，超山之神，即雨。則與士遜何異哉』。

local officials remained nearly unchanged. Furthermore, in order to understand that local officials were cognizant of their predecessors at the time of rain prayers, we only need to look at the fact that large-scale upheaval did not necessarily rupture the consciousness of local society, as the success stories of rain prayers as an unbroken tradition continued to be told. Consequently, the performance of the rain rituals preserved the memory of earlier officials who had long since departed. This was not only from hearsay accounts that compared the moral character of contemporary officials with previous officials, but was also recorded on various steles, and can be seen from the change in miracles, which became more conspicuous as the age progressed—from Yu Yanhe of the Northern Song praying three times for rain, to Lan Siji and Kou Juqing of the Jin praying and immediately receiving a response, to Liang Tianxiang of the Mongol empire getting rain in the middle of his prayers, and to Wanyan Deitemür of the Yuan getting rain immediately upon praying and then again five days later upon his sacrifice to the god.

This is to say, the origins and development of the Yingrun hou temple illustrate the following: that deities endowed with authority by the dynasty were accepted in local society, that local officials followed established precedent in displaying authority and control, that the relationship between local society and local officials developed on its own time frame separate from the rise and fall of dynasties, and finally, that local officials recognized and gave precedence to their predecessors in office.

**Conclusion**

To conclude this investigation I wish to emphasize the following: the majority of temples that granted honors and titles in the Northern Song also continued to maintain their influence in local society in the Jin and Yuan; the primary factor that continued to make them worship sites for contemporary local officials appears to have been that the honors and titles bestowed upon them established authority within local society and set precedents for successive local officials of the Jin and Yuan to follow. With this background, we can conjecture that the system of worship established by the Jin and Yuan did not arise from disorder, that local officials took an active part in temple worship, and that there was a considerable movement of authority to local temples—which also occurred in the Southern Song at the same time. Given the tendency
of local officials to engage in temple worship, it appears that the position of these officials continued to be constrained by both dynastic regulations on worship, as well as the precedent set in their localities by their predecessors. In the consciousness of people who lived through the fall of dynasties and the chaos of war, a specific practice continued unbroken, which might be called a genealogy of succession among local officials.

As stated in the introduction, research on the activities of local officials and their governance in Northern China under the Jin and Yuan has only been taken up from a single dynastic perspective, not a trans-dynastic one. This article has shown, however, that the authority of local officials and the aspects of their control did not necessarily concur with the chaos of war and the change of dynasties, or even with shifts of policy. Rather, there was distinct influence and inheritance of practice across dynasties. That is to say, looking at the continuities through time across dynasties illuminates the historical realities on the ground and the changing aspects of a society rocked by war and ruled by different groups. These points should be emphasized when investigating North China under the Jin and Yuan.

On a final note, I should say that it is certainly not the case that all aspects of prefectural and county control in North China under the Jin and Yuan have been made entirely clear in this study of temple worship. Indeed, there are many unsettled points concerning the administrative control and continuity from the Northern Song to the Jin and Yuan. Furthermore, my topic here has been confined to Shanxi; it is necessary to investigate further to determine whether or not the conclusions of this article can be extrapolated for other regions—something I will take up in future research.